



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/420,503	10/18/1999	CAMERON STUART BIRSE	004860.P2434	2896

7590 04/23/2003

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/420,503

Applicant(s)

BIRSE ET AL.

Examiner

Thong H Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over Porter [6,357,040 B1] in view of Blanset et al [Blanset 4,747,040]
3. As per claim 1, Porter discloses a method comprising a network computer (NC) client causing a plurality of NC clients are booted to receive operating system software that is configured differently than a first operating system software in effect by replacing a first set of one or more system volumes maintained at a NC server containing the first operating system software with a second set of one or more system volumes maintained at the NC server containing second operating system software [first and second set of software object, Porter abstract, col 1 lines 40-52, col 2 lines 48-67, col 3 lines 23-50, col 5 line 36-col 6 line 46; working copy, col 7 line 45-col 8 line 11].

Port did not teach in detail a computer or server maintained a first and second operating software. It is well-known in the art that a computer could maintained two operating system software as taught by Blanset [Blanset abstract]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the server contains a one or more operating system software volumes as taught by Blanset into the Porter's apparatus in

order to utilize the software customization in order to provide more than one software operating system with a working copy to network clients. Doing so would provide a dynamic, efficient and friendly approach to the network clients .

4. Claim 14 and 15 contains similar limitation set forth the rejected claimed 1. Thus, claims 14-15 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 1.

5. As per claim 2,3,11-13 contains the similar limitation set forth the rejected claim 1 except the NC clients causing a plurality of NC clients that are subsequently booted to utilize modified operating system by modifying the working copy and replacing the one or more system volumes with the working copy which is equivalent to the customized software copy or the partially replaced software [Porter col 3 lines 23-35, col 7 line 45-col 8 line 11].

6. As per claims 4,7,9 Porter-Blanset disclose the NC client causing those of the plurality of NC clients that subsequently open an application to utilize a modified version of the application by replacing the first set of one or more system volumes, wherein the first set of one or more system volumes further comprises application software which is equivalent to the customized software copy or the partially replaced software [Porter col 3 lines 23-35, col 7 line 45-col 8 line 11].

7. As per claim 5, Porter-Blanset disclose wherein at least one NC client is not rebooted for a period of time after replacing the first set of one or more system volumes as inherent feature or regenerating object code [Porter col 7 lines 35-44].

8. As per claims 6,8,10 Porter-Blanset disclose the operating software as UNIX and MS-DOS [Blanset abstract].

Art Unit: 2142

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Thong Vu, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell, can be reached at (703) 305-9703.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

